

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

FINANCE, AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE MEETING 6TH FEBRUARY 2018 COUNCIL CHAMBERS NABAWA 2.00PM

Committee Purpose & Delegations

Will meet on an annual basis to provide a review of Council's ongoing financial situation, provide a forum for ongoing review of strategic management plan for Council operations and discuss the Audit System.

Delegation - Nil

| The Finance, Audit & Risk Committee is | comprised of:- |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cr A Farrell Cr T Royce | |
| Cr D Forth | |
| Chief Executive Officer Manager Finance & Corporate Services Accountant Executive Assistant Greg Godwin – Moore Stephens WA | (Observer) (Observer) (Observer) (Minute Taker) (Auditor) |

DISCLAIMER



No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Shire of Chapman Valley for any act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council Meeting. The Shire of Chapman Valley disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council or Committee Meetings.

Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a Council Meeting does so at that person's or legal entity's own risk.

The Shire of Chapman Valley warns that anyone who has any application or request with the Shire of Chapman Valley must obtain and should rely on written confirmation of the outcome of the application or request of the decision made by the Shire of Chapman Valley.

Maurice Battilana CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

FINANCE, AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE MEETING TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NABAWA FRIDAY 6th FEBRUARY 2018 AT 2.00PM

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1.0 Election of Presiding Members

Mr Battilana opened the meeting at 2.02pm and called for nominations for Presiding Member.

Cr Forth nominated Cr Farrell as Presiding Member, Cr Farrell accepted and assumed the Chair.

CARRIED 2/0

2.0 Declaration of Opening / Announcements of Visitors

Cr Farrell welcomed Elected Members and staff to the Finance, Audit & Risk Committee meeting.

3.0 Announcements from the Presiding Member

Nil

4.0 Attendance

4.1 Present

a. Councillors

| Members |
|--------------------------------|
| Cr Anthony Farrell (President) |
| Cr Darrell Forth |

b. Staff

| Officer | Position |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Mr Maurice Battilana | Chief Executive Officer |
| Mrs Dianne Raymond | Manager of Finance & Corporate Services |
| Mrs Karen McKay | Executive Services Administrator (Minute |
| | Taker) |

c. Visitors

| Name | |
|----------------|----------------------------------------|
| Mr Greg Godwin | Moore Stephens WA – Auditor (via phone |
| | link) from 2.05pm to 2.25pm |

4.2 Apologies

Cr Trevor Royce

5.0 Declaration of Interest

Members should fill in Disclosure of Interest forms for items in which they have a financial, proximity or impartiality interest and forward these to the Presiding Member before the meeting commences.

Section 5.60A:

"a person has a **financial interest** in a matter if it is reasonable to expect that the matter will, if dealt with by the local government, or an employee or committee of the local government or member of the council of the local government, in a particular way, result in a financial gain, loss, benefit or detriment for the person."

Section 5.60B:

"a person has a proximity interest in a matter if the matter concerns –(a) a proposed change to a planning scheme affecting land that adjoins the person's land; or
(b) a proposed change to the zoning or use of land that adjoins the person's land; or
(c) a proposed development (as defined in section 5.63(5)) of land that adjoins the person's land."

Regulation 34C (Impartiality):

"interest means an interest that could, or could reasonably be perceived to, adversely affect the impartiality of the person having the interest and includes an interest arising from kinship, friendship or membership of an association."

6.0 Petitions / Deputations / Presentations

Nil

7.0 Confirmation of Minutes from previous meetings

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

MOVED: CR FORTH SECONDED: CR FARRELL

Finance and Audit Committee Meeting held on 10th February 2017

Recommend that the Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee of the Shire of Chapman Valley held on Friday 10th February 2017 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings. (Supplied under separate cover).

CARRIED Voting 2/0 Minute Reference FAC 02/18 - 1

8.0 Items to be dealt with En Bloc

Nil

10.0

9.0 Officers' Reports

| 9.1 | Management Report 30 June 2016 | Page 6 |
|--------|------------------------------------|---------|
| 9.2 | Audit Report 30 June 2016 | Page 11 |
| 9.3 | Compliance Audit Return 2016 | Page 14 |
| Inforr | nation Items | |
| 10.1 | Risk Management Procedure (Review) | Page 26 |

Chief Executive Officer February 2018

Contents

9.0 AGENDA ITEMS

- 9.1 Management Report (30 June 2017)
- 9.2 Audit Report (30 June 2017)
- 9.3 Compliance Audit Report (2017)

| AGENDA ITEM: | 9.1 |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| SUBJECT: | MANAGEMENT REPORT - 30 JUNE 2017 |
| PROPONENT: | FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE |
| SITE: | COUNCIL CHAMBERS |
| FILE REFERENCE: | 305.05 |
| PREVIOUS REFERENCE: | N/A |
| DATE: | 6 th FEBRUARY 2018 |
| AUTHOR: | MAURICE BATTILANA & DIANNE RAYMOND |

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

| Ref | Title | 1 | iched to port | Under Separate Cover |
|--------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 9.1(a) | Management Report 2016/2017 | ١ | / | |

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

BACKGROUND

The Shire of Chapman Valley has received the Management Report from its Auditors - Moore Stephens (Please refer to Management Report Letter submitted at *Attachment 9.1(a)*).

COMMENT

The Management Report is attached, which identifies all areas raised by the Auditors for Committee and Council consideration.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Part 7 Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None applicable

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The long term financial viability of the Shire is of importance for future service delivery levels provided to the Shire's constituents.

• Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):

The annual audit of the Shire's operations is integral to monitoring how the Shire is tracking with its integrated strategic planning.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

The annual audit of the Shire's operations is integral to monitoring how the Shire is tracking with its integrated strategic planning.

• <u>Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:</u>

| Ref | Objective | Strategy | Action |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Ensure governance and administration systems, policies and processes are current and relevant | Review policy categories and set ongoing accountability for review processes | Review current Council and Management policies and formalise update process and timelines. |

CONSULTATION

Council staff have been in contact and discussion with Council auditors throughout the audit review process.

RISK ASSESSMENT

The audit report has not highlighted any significant areas of risk.

| Measures of Consequence | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Rating (Level) | Health Financial Impact | | Service Interruption | Compliance | Reputational | Property | Environment | |
| Insignificant (1) | Negligible injuries | Less than \$1,000 | No material service interruption | No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact | Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item | Inconsequential or no damage. | Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response | |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE / STAFF RECOMMENDATION

MOVED: CR FARRELL

SECONDED: CR FORTH

The Finance, Audit & Risk Committee recommends to Council the Management Report for year ending 30 June 2017 be received and, other than monitoring the levels and trends of all ratios, there are no actions required out of the report.

CARRIED Voting 2/0 Minute Reference FAC 02/18 - 2

Record NoA0172372

| CEO | MB |
|---------------------|----|
| CORPORATE SERVICES. | OR |
| PLANNING | |
| WORKS & SERVICES | |
| RANGER | |
| PROPERTY MANAGER | |
| EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT | |

0 5 DEC 2017

MOORE STEPHENS

Level 15, Exchange Tower, 2 The Esplanade, Perth, WA 6000

PO Box 5785, St Georges Terrace, WA 6831

+61 (0)8 9225 5355 +61 (0)8 9225 6181

www.moorestephenswa.com.au

Dear Cr Collingwood

29 November 2017

The Shire President Shire of Chapman Valley

NABAWA WA 6532

PO Box 1

Management Report for the Year Ended 30 June 2017

We advise that we have completed our audit procedures for the year ended 30 June 2017 and enclose our Audit Report.

We are required under the Local Government Audit Regulations to report certain compliance matters in our audit report. Other matters which arise during the course of our audit that we wish to bring to Council's attention are raised in this management report.

It should be appreciated that our audit procedures are designed primarily to enable us to form an opinion on the financial statements and therefore may not bring to light all weaknesses in systems and procedures which may exist. However, we aim to use our knowledge of the Shire's organisation gained during our work to make comments and suggestions which, we hope, will be useful to you.

COMMENT ON RATIOS

Ratios provide useful information when compared to industry and internal benchmarks and assist in identifying trends. Whilst not conclusive in themselves, understanding ratios, their trends and how they interact is beneficial for the allocation of scarce resources and planning for the future. Information relating to the statutory ratios disclosed in the financial report is summarised in the table below and commentary provided on the following pages.

| | Target Actua | | Sh | ire's Adju | usted Rati | ios | | Shire's 5 Year | 5 Year Av | erage |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|------------|------------|-------|--------|-------------------|-----------|--------|
| | Ratio | 2017 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | Trend * | Regional | State |
| Current Ratio | ≥ 1 | 3.70 | 2.82* | 2.50 | 2.95* | 1.56* | 1.84 | Ť | 3.18 | 2.22 |
| Asset Sustainability Ratio | ≥ 1.1 | 1.41 | 1.41 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 2.15 | 1.47 | 1 | 1.18 | 1.18 |
| Debt Service Cover Ratio | ≥ 15 | 28.35 | 21.56* | 31.22* | 5.67* | 5.45* | 1.22 | 1 | 10.62 | 12.41 |
| Operating Surplus Ratio | ≥ 0.15 | (0.12) | (0.27)* | 0.13* | (0.09)* | 0.01* | (0.37) | + | (0.17) | (0.11) |
| Own Source Revenue Coverage Ratio | ≥ 0.9 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.51 | 4 | 0.56 | 0.67 |
| Asset Consumption Ratio | ≥ 0.75 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.98 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.83 | Ť | 0.66 | 0.73 |
| Asset Renewal Funding Ratio | ≥ 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.69 | Ť | 0.91 | 0.94 |

1 Target ratios per Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries (DLGSCL) Guidelines except the Debt Service Ratio which is a target devised by Moore Stephens (and based on experience). For information, DLGSCL Guidelines indicate a target Debt Service Cover Ratio of 5.

2 The 5-year trend compares the adjusted 2017 ratio to the average of the adjusted ratios for the last 5 years.

3 The average in relation to the Regional and State comparisons is a 5 year average of 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016.

* Adjusted for "one-off" timing/ non-cash items.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation. Moore Stephens ABN 16 874 357 907. An independent member of Moore Stephens International Limited - members in principal cities throughout the world. The Perth Moore Stephens firm is not a partner or agent of any other Moore Stephens firm.

COMMENT ON RATIOS (CONTINUED)

MOORE STEPHENS

Adjustments relating to 2017

Three of the ratios in the accompanying table were distorted by an item of significant revenue relating to the early payment of 2017/18 Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) totaling \$447,782 received before 30 June 2017. The early payment of the grant increased operating revenue in 2017.

This item is considered "one-off" in nature and was adjusted when calculating the ratios in the above table (as shown by "*") as were relevant comparative year ratios (which had been affected by similar "one-off" items).

Regional and State 5 Year Averages

Regional and State 5 year averages have not been adjusted for "one-off" items even though these items may have been applicable in prior years as they are based on the statutory ratios which have been reported in published financial reports. However, they still provide a useful reference point as they are indicative of a trend.

Commentary on specific ratios

Operating Surplus Ratio

This ratio represents the percentage by which the operating surplus (or deficit) differs from the Shire's own source revenue which includes rates and operating grants.

This ratio has deteriorated significantly from the previous year. In addition, it is below the target level and both the Regional and State 5 year average and it has been trending downwards.

Analysis of the Shire's Statement of Comprehensive Income noted the deterioration of the ratio is attributable mostly to last year including a reversal of prior year loss on revaluation of plant and equipment. Total operating income and expenses remain at a similar level to last year with an increase in the depreciation expense being offset by a decrease in materials and contract expenditure.

A negative ratio indicates the local government is experiencing an operating deficit. A sustained period of deficits will erode Council's ability to maintain its operational service level and asset base over the longer term whilst a positive ratio which is consistently above 0.15 provides the Shire with greater flexibility in meeting operational service levels and asset management requirements.

In order to progress towards a positive ratio, we urge both Council and Management to continue their existing efforts in improving the operating position. Again, this is dependent upon Council and management understanding the different circumstances and the interaction operating surplus has on other ratios and operations in general.

Summary

Overall, the Shire's ratio position appears to be stable and generally above the target levels.

Whilst some ratios are below the accepted industry benchmark, given the relative strength of the other ratios, lower ratios may be expected, provided other measures/strategies are maximised.

Notwithstanding this, two of the ratios do appear to be trending downwards over the longer term and this should be considered moving forward.

We would like to take this opportunity to stress one off assessments of ratios at a particular point in time can only provide a snapshot of the financial position and operating situation of the Shire. As is the case with all ratios and indicators, their interpretation is much improved if they are calculated as an average over time with the relevant trends being considered.

We will continue to monitor the financial position and ratios in future financial years and suggest it is prudent for Council and management to do so also as they strive to manage the scarce resources of the Shire.

MOORE STEPHENS

If the Shire requires, we have a report available which is able to compare your ratios against other Local Governments across the State and by Region. The report is also able to incorporate a selection of your peer Local Governments, whether they be of near neighbours or similar type in nature. This may be of particular relevance in your case as you are included in the Mid-West region when comparison to other, more similar local governments, may be more relevant.

If you are interested in such an expanded report, please contact us.

We noted no other matters we wish to bring to your attention.

UNCORRECTED MISSTATEMENTS

We advise there were no uncorrected misstatements noted during the course of our audit. We take this opportunity to thank all staff for the assistance provided during the audit.

Should you wish to discuss any matter relating to the audit or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully

Greg Godwin

Partner Moore Stephens

Encl.

| AGENDA ITEM: | 9.2 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| SUBJECT: | INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT - 30 JUNE 2017 |
| PROPONENT: | FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE |
| SITE: | COUNCIL CHAMBERS |
| FILE REFERENCE: | 403.05 & 305.12 |
| PREVIOUS REFERENCE: | N/A |
| DATE: | 6th FEBRUARY 2018 |
| AUTHOR: | MAURICE BATTILANA |

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

| Ref | Title | Attached to Report | Under Separate Cover |
|--------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9.2(a) | Independent Auditors Report 2016/2017 | | |

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

BACKGROUND

The Shire of Chapman Valley has received the final Independent Audit Report from its Auditors Moore Stephens. (Please refer to *Attachment 9.2(a)*).

COMMENT

As the Independent Audit Report didn't highlight any issues there is nothing to report on or bring to Council attention for further action.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Part 7 Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The long term financial viability of the Shire is of importance for future service delivery levels provided to the Shire's constituents.

• Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):

The annual audit of the Shire's operations is integral to monitoring how the Shire is tracking with its integrated strategic planning.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

The annual audit of the Shire's operations is integral to monitoring how the Shire is tracking with its integrated strategic planning.

• <u>Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:</u>

| Ref | Objective | Strategy | Action |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Ensure governance and administration systems, policies and processes are current and relevant | Review policy categories and set ongoing accountability for review processes | Review current Council and Management policies and formalise update process and timelines. |

CONSULTATION

Council staff have been in contact and discussion with Council auditors throughout the audit review process.

RISK ASSESSMENT

The audit report has not highlighted any significant areas of risk.

| | Measures of Consequence | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Rating (Level) | Health | Financial Impact | Service Interruption | Compliance | Reputational | Property | Environment | | |
| Insignificant (1) | Negligible injuries | Less than \$1,000 | No material service interruption | No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact | Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item | Inconsequential or no damage. | Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response | | |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE / STAFF RECOMMENDATION

MOVED: CR FORTH

SECONDED: CR FARRELL

The Finance, Audit & Risk Committee recommends to Council the Final Audit Report of the Chief Executive Officer the year ending 30 June 2017 be received and it be noted there are no further actions required from the report.

CARRIED Voting 2/0 Minute Reference FAC 02/18 - 3

Greg Godwin left the meeting at 2.25pm

ATTACHMENT 9.2(a)

MOORE STEPHENS

Level 15, Exchange Tower, 2 The Esplanade, Perth, WA 6000

PO Box 5785, St Georges Terrace, WA 6831

| | 10 box 5705, 5t beorges terr |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| TO THE ELECTORS OF THE SHIRE OF CHAPMAN VALLEY | T +61 (0)8 9225 5355 F +61 (0)8 9225 6181 |
| | +01 (0)0 2552 0101 |

www.moorestephenswa.com.au

Opinion on the Audit of the Financial Report

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

We have audited the accompanying financial report of the Shire of Chapman Valley (the Shire), which comprises the statement of financial position as at 30 June 2017, statement of comprehensive income by nature or type, statement of comprehensive income by program, statement of changes in equity, statement of cash flows and the rate setting statement for the year then ended, notes comprising a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information and the statement by Chief Executive Officer.

In our opinion, the financial report of the Shire of Chapman Valley is in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended) and the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 (as amended), including:

- a) giving a true and fair view of the Shire's financial position as at 30 June 2017 and of its financial performance and its cash flows for the year ended on that date; and
- b) complying with Australian Accounting Standards (including Australian Accounting Interpretations).

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audit in accordance with Australian Auditing Standards. Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Report section of our report. We are independent of the Shire in accordance with the ethical requirements of the Accounting Professional and Ethical Standards Board's APES 110 *Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants* (the "Code") that are relevant to our audit of the financial report in Australia. We have also fulfilled our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with the Code. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

Report on Other Legal and Regulatory Requirements

In accordance with the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996, we also report that:

- a) There are no matters that in our opinion indicate significant adverse trends in the financial position or the financial management practices of the Shire.
- b) No matters indicating non-compliance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act 1995 (as amended), the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 (as amended) or applicable financial controls of any other written law were noted during the course of our audit.
- c) In relation to the Supplementary Ratio Information presented at page 60 of this report, we have reviewed the calculations as presented and nothing has come to our attention to suggest it is not:
 - i. verifiable information; and
 - ii. reasonably assumption.
- d) All necessary information and explanations were obtained by us.
- e) All audit procedures were satisfactorily completed in conducting our audit.

58

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation. Moore Stephens ABN 16 874 357 907. An independent member of Moore Stephens international Limited - members in principal cities throughout the world. The Perth Moore Stephens firm is not a partner or agent of any other Moore Stephens firm.

MOORE STEPHENS

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT TO THE ELECTORS OF THE SHIRE OF CHAPMAN VALLEY (CONTINUED)

Other Information

Management is responsible for the other information. The other information comprises the information included in the Shire's annual report for the year ended 30 June 2017 but does not include the financial report and our auditor's report thereon.

Our opinion on the financial report does not cover the other information and accordingly we do not express any form of assurance conclusion thereon.

Responsibilities of Management and Council for the Financial Report

Management is responsible for the preparation of this financial report that gives a true and fair view in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards, the *Local Government Act 1995 (as amended)* and the *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 (as amended)* and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of the financial report that is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial report, management is responsible for assessing the Shire's ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing, as applicable, matters related to going concern and using the going concern basis of accounting.

The Council is responsible for overseeing the Shire's financial reporting process.

Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Report

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial report as a whole is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with Australian Auditing Standards will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of this financial report.

A further description of our responsibilities for the audit of the financial report is located at the Auditing and Assurance Standards Board website at: <u>http://www.auasb.gov.au/auditors_files/ar3.pdf</u>. This description forms part of our auditor's report.

MOORE STEPHENS CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS

GREG GODWIN PARTNER

Date: 29 November 2017 Perth, WA

| AGENDA ITEM: | 9.3 |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| SUBJECT: | COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN (2017) |
| PROPONENT: | FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE |
| SITE: | COUNCIL CHAMBERS |
| FILE REFERENCE: | 403.05 & 305.12 |
| PREVIOUS REFERENCE: | N/A |
| DATE: | 6th FEBRUARY 2018 |
| AUTHOR: | MAURICE BATTILANA |

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

| Ref | Title | Attached to Report | Under Separate Cover |
|--------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9.3(a) | Compliance Audit Report 2017 | \checkmark | |

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

BACKGROUND

Every Local Government Authority in Western Australia is required to complete the Compliance Audit Return (CAR) each year. The purpose of this item is to present the 2017 Compliance Audit Return to the Committee to review prior to going to Council for formal adoption and forward a certified copy to the Department of Local Government.

COMMENT

A Draft copy of the Shire of Chapman Valley 2017 Compliance Audit Return has been provided to Councillors as *Attachment 9.3(a)*.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Local Government Act 1995

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

| Ref | Objective | Strategy | Action |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Ensure governance and administration systems, policies and processes are current and relevant | Review policy categories and set ongoing accountability for review processes | Review current Council and Management policies and formalise update process and timelines. |

CONSULTATION

Council staff have been consulted as part of the process to complete the Compliance Audit Report.

RISK ASSESSMENT

The Compliance Audit Report has not highlighted any significant areas of risk.

| | Measures of Consequence | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Rating (Level) | Health | Financial Impact | Service Interruption | Compliance | Reputational | Property | Environment | | |
| Insignificant (1) | Negligible injuries | Less than \$1,000 | No material service interruption | No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact | Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item | Inconsequential or no damage. | Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response | | |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE / STAFF RECOMMENDATION

MOVED: CR FARRELL SECONDED: CR FORTH

The Finance, Audit & Risk Committee recommends the following to Council:

- 1. The 2017 Compliance Audit Return be signed by the CEO and Shire President
- 2. The 2017 Compliance Audit Return be received and recorded in the Minutes of Council
- 3. The 2017 Compliance Audit Return is submitted to the Department of Local Government

CARRIED Voting 2/0 Minute Reference FAC 02/18 - 4

ATTACHMENT 9.3(a)

٦

Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries - Compliance Audit Return



Department of Local Government, Sport - and Cultural Industries

Chapman Valley - Compliance Audit Return 2017

Certified Copy of Return

Г

Please submit a signed copy to the Director General of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries together with a copy of section of relevant minutes.

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,9 | Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major trading undertaking in 2017. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,10 | Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major land transaction that was not exempt in 2017. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,10 | Has the local government prepared a business plan before entering into each land transaction that was preparatory to entry into a major land transaction in 2017. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s3.59(4) | Has the local government given Statewide public notice of each proposal to commence a major trading undertaking or enter into a major land transaction for 2017. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | s3.59(5) | Did the Council, during 2017, resolve to proceed with each major land transaction or trading undertaking by absolute majority. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s5.16, 5.17, 5.18 | Were all delegations to committees resolved by absolute majority. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s5.16, 5.17, 5.18 | Were all delegations to committees in writing. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | s5.16, 5.17, 5.18 | Were all delegations to committees within the limits specified in section 5.17. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s5.16, 5.17, 5.18 | Were all delegations to committees recorded in a register of delegations. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | s5.18 | Has Council reviewed delegations to its committees in the 2016/2017 financial year. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | s5.42(1),5.43 Admin Reg 18G | Did the powers and duties of the Council delegated to the CEO exclude those as listed in section 5.43 of the Act. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 7 | s5.42(1)(2) Admin Reg 18G | Were all delegations to the CEO resolved by an absolute majority. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 8 | s5.42(1)(2) Admin Reg 18G | Were all delegations to the CEO in writing. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 9 | s5.44(2) | Were all delegations by the CEO to any employee in writing. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 10 | s5.45(1)(b) | Were all decisions by the Council to amend or revoke a delegation made by absolute majority. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 11 | s5.46(1) | Has the CEO kept a register of all delegations made under the Act to him and to other employees. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 12 | s5.46(2) | Were all delegations made under Division 4 of Part 5 of the Act reviewed by the delegator at least once during the 2016/2017 financial year. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 13 | s5.46(3) Admin Reg 19 | Did all persons exercising a delegated power or duty under the Act keep, on all occasions, a written record as required. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |

Disclosure of Interest

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s5.67 | If a member disclosed an interest, did he/she ensure that they did not remain present to participate in any discussion or decision-making procedure relating to the matter in which the interest was disclosed (not including participation approvals granted under s5.68). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s5.68(2) | Were all decisions made under section 5.68(1), and the extent of participation allowed, recorded in the minutes of Council and Committee meetings. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 3 | s5.73 | Were disclosures under section 5.65 or 5.70 recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the disclosure was made. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s5.75(1) Admin Reg 22 Form 2 | Was a primary return lodged by all newly elected members within three months of their start day. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | s5.75(1) Admin Reg 22 Form 2 | Was a primary return lodged by all newly designated employees within three months of their start day. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | s5.76(1) Admin Reg 23 Form 3 | Was an annual return lodged by all continuing elected members by 31 August 2017. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 7 | s5.76(1) Admin Reg 23 Form 3 | Was an annual return lodged by all designated employees by 31 August 2017. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 8 | s5.77 | On receipt of a primary or annual return, did the CEO, (or the Mayor/ President in the case of the CEO's return) on all occasions, give written acknowledgment of having received the return. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 9 | s5.88(1)(2) Admin Reg 28 | Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained the returns lodged under section 5.75 and 5.76 | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 10 | s5.88(1)(2) Admin Reg 28 | Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained a record of disclosures made under sections 5.65, 5.70 and 5.71, in the form prescribed in Administration Regulation 28. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 11 | s5.88 (3) | Has the CEO removed all returns from the register when a person ceased to be a person required to lodge a return under section 5.75 or 5.76. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 12 | s5.88(4) | Have all returns lodged under section 5.75 or 5.76 and removed from the register, been kept for a period of at least five years, after the person who lodged the return ceased to be a council member or designated employee. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 13 | s5.103 Admin Reg 34C & Rules of Conduct Reg 11 | Where an elected member or an employee disclosed an interest in a matter discussed at a Council or committee meeting where there was a reasonable belief that the impartiality of the person having the interest would be adversely affected, was it recorded in the minutes. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 14 | s5.70(2) | Where an employee had an interest in any matter in respect of which the employee provided advice or a report directly to the Council or a Committee, did that person disclose the nature of that interest when giving the advice or report. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport – and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 15 | s5.70(3) | Where an employee disclosed an interest under s5.70(2), did that person also disclose the extent of that interest when required to do so by the Council or a Committee. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 16 | s5.103(3) Admin Reg 34B | Has the CEO kept a register of all notifiable gifts received by Council members and employees. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |

Disposal of Property

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s3.58(3) | Was local public notice given prior to disposal for any property not disposed of by public auction or tender (except where excluded by Section 3.58(5)). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s3.58(4) | Where the local government disposed of property under section 3.58(3), did it provide details, as prescribed by section 3.58(4), in the required local public notice for each disposal of property. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |

Elections

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Elect Reg 30G (1) | Did the CEO establish and maintain an electoral gift register and ensure that all 'disclosure of gifts' forms completed by candidates and received by the CEO were placed on the electoral gift register at the time of receipt by the CEO and in a manner that clearly identifies and distinguishes the candidates. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |

Finance

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s7.1A | Has the local government established an audit committee and appointed members by absolute majority in accordance with section 7.1A of the Act. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s7.1B | Where a local government determined to delegate to its audit committee any powers or duties under Part 7 of the Act, did it do so by absolute majority. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | s7.3 | Was the person(s) appointed by the local government to be its auditor, a registered company auditor. | Yes | , | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s7.3, 7.6(3) | Was the person or persons appointed by the local government to be its auditor, appointed by an absolute majority decision of Council. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 5 | Audit Reg 10 | Was the Auditor's report for the financial year ended 30 June 2017 received by the local government within 30 days of completion of the audit. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | s7.9(1) | Was the Auditor's report for the financial year ended 30 June 2017 received by the local government by 31 December 2017. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 7 | S7.12A(3) | Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act required action to be taken by the local government, was that action undertaken. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 8 | S7.12A (4) | Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report (prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act) required action to be taken by the local government, was a report prepared on any actions undertaken. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 9 | S7.12A (4) | Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report (prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act) required action to be taken by the local government, was a copy of the report forwarded to the Minister by the end of the financial year or 6 months after the last report prepared under s7.9 was received by the local government whichever was the latest in time. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 10 | Audit Reg 7 | Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the objectives of the audit. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 11 | Audit Reg 7 | Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the scope of the audit. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 12 | Audit Reg 7 | Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include a plan for the audit. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 13 | Audit Reg 7 | Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include details of the remuneration and expenses to be paid to the auditor. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 14 | Audit Reg 7 | Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the method to be used by the local government to communicate with, and supply information to, the auditor. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | s5.56 Admin Reg 19DA (6) | Has the local government adopted a Corporate Business Plan. If Yes, please provide adoption date of the most recent Plan in Comments. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | No | To be considered at February 2018 Council Meeting. | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s5.56 Admin Reg 19DA (6) | Has the local government adopted a modification to the most recent Corporate Business Plan. If Yes, please provide adoption date in Comments. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | No | To be considered at February 2018 Council Meeting. | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | s5.56 Admin Reg 19C (7) | Has the local government adopted a Strategic Community Plan. If Yes, please provide adoption date of the most recent Plan in Comments. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | Yes | 15th November 2017 Minute Ref: 11/17-5 | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s5.56 Admin Reg 19C (7) | Has the local government adopted a modification to the most recent Strategic Community Plan. If Yes, please provide adoption date in Comments. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | Yes | 15th November 2017 Minute Ref: 11/17-5 | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | S5.56 | Has the local government adopted an Asset Management Plan. If Yes, in Comments please provide date of the most recent Plan, plus if adopted or endorsed by Council the date of adoption or endorsement. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | Yes | July 2017 | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | \$5.56 | Has the local government adopted a Long Term Financial Plan. If Yes, in Comments please provide date of the most recent Plan, plus if adopted or endorsed by Council the date of adoption or endorsement. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | Yes | July 2017 | Maurice Battilana |
| 7 | S5.56 | Has the local government adopted a Workforce Plan. If Yes, in Comments please provide date of the most recent Plan plus if adopted or endorsed by Council the date of adoption or endorsement. This question is optional, answer N/A if you choose not to respond. | Yes | 2015 | Maurice Battilana |



г

Department of Local Government, Sport - and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Admin Reg 18C | Did the local government approve the process to be used for the selection and appointment of the CEO before the position of CEO was advertised. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s5.36(4) s5.37(3), Admin Reg 18A | Were all vacancies for the position of CEO and other designated senior employees advertised and did the advertising comply with s.5.36(4), 5.37(3) and Admin Reg 18A. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | Admin Reg 18F | Was the remuneration and other benefits paid to a CEO on appointment the same remuneration and benefits advertised for the position of CEO under section 5.36(4). | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | Admin Regs 18E | Did the local government ensure checks were carried out to confirm that the information in an application for employment was true (applicable to CEO only). | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | s5.37(2) | Did the CEO inform council of each proposal to employ or dismiss a designated senior employee. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport - and Cultural Industries

Official Conduct

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | s5.120 | Where the CEO is not the complaints officer, has the local government designated a senior employee, as defined under s5.37, to be its complaints officer. | N/A | CEO is Complaints Officer | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | s5.121(1) | Has the complaints officer for the local government maintained a register of complaints which records all complaints that result in action under s5.110(6)(b) or (c). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | s5.121(2)(a) | Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording of the name of the council member about whom the complaint is made. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | s5.121(2)(b) | Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording the name of the person who makes the complaint. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 5 | s5.121(2)(c) | Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording a description of the minor breach that the standards panel finds has occured. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | s5.121(2)(d) | Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include the provision to record details of the action taken under s5.110(6)(b) or (c). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |

Tenders for Providing Goods and Services

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | s3.57 F&G Reg 11 | Did the local government invite tenders on all occasions (before entering into contracts for the supply of goods or services) where the consideration under the contract was, or was expected to be, worth more than the consideration stated in Regulation 11(1) of the Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations (Subject to Functions and General Regulation 11(2)). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 2 | F&G Reg 12 | Did the local government comply with F&G Reg 12 when deciding to enter into multiple contracts rather than inviting tenders for a single contract. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 3 | F&G Reg 14(1) & (3) | Did the local government invite tenders via Statewide public notice. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 4 | F&G Reg 14 & 15 | Did the local government's advertising and tender documentation comply with F&G Regs 14, 15 & 16. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 5 | F&G Reg 14(5) | If the local government sought to vary the information supplied to tenderers, was every reasonable step taken to give each person who sought copies of the tender documents or each acceptable tenderer, notice of the variation. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 6 | F&G Reg 16 | Did the local government's procedure for receiving and opening tenders comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 16. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 7 | F&G Reg 18(1) | Did the local government reject the tenders that were not submitted at the place, and within the time specified in the invitation to tender. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 8 | F&G Reg 18 (4) | In relation to the tenders that were not rejected, did the local government assess which tender to accept and which tender was most advantageous to the local government to accept, by means of written evaluation criteria. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 9 | F&G Reg 17 | Did the information recorded in the local government's tender register comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 17. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 10 | F&G Reg 19 | Was each tenderer sent written notice advising particulars of the successful tender or advising that no tender was accepted. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 11 | F&G Reg 21 & 22 | Did the local governments's advertising and expression of interest documentation comply with the requirements of F&G Regs 21 and 22. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 12 | F&G Reg 23(1) | Did the local government reject the expressions of interest that were not submitted at the place and within the time specified in the notice. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 13 | F&G Reg 23(4) | After the local government considered expressions of interest, did the CEO list each person considered capable of satisfactorily supplying goods or services. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 14 | F&G Reg 24 | Was each person who submitted an expression of interest, given a notice in writing in accordance with Functions & General Regulation 24. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 15 | F&G Reg 24AD(2) | Did the local government invite applicants for a panel of pre-qualified suppliers via Statewide public notice. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 16 | F&G Reg 24AD(4) & 24AE | Did the local government's advertising and panel documentation comply with F&G Regs 24AD(4) & 24AE. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport – and Cultural Industries

| No | Reference | Question | Response | Comments | Respondent |
|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 17 | F&G Reg 24AF | Did the local government's procedure for receiving and opening applications to join a panel of pre-qualified suppliers comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 16 as if the reference in that regulation to a tender were a reference to a panel application. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 18 | F&G Reg 24AD(6) | If the local government to sought to vary the information supplied to the panel, was every reasonable step taken to give each person who sought detailed information about the proposed panel or each person who submitted an application, notice of the variation. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 19 | F&G Reg 24AH(1) | Did the local government reject the applications to join a panel of pre- qualified suppliers that were not submitted at the place, and within the time specified in the invitation for applications. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 20 | F&G Reg 24AH(3) | In relation to the applications that were not rejected, did the local government assess which application (s) to accept and which application(s) were most advantageous to the local government to accept, by means of written evaluation criteria. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 21 | F&G Reg 24AG | Did the information recorded in the local government's tender register about panels of pre-qualified suppliers, comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 24AG. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 22 | F&G Reg 24AI | Did the local government send each person who submitted an application, written notice advising if the person's application was accepted and they are to be part of a panel of pre-qualified suppliers, or, that the application was not accepted. | N/A | | Maurice Battilana |
| 23 | F&G Reg 24E | Where the local government gave a regional price preference in relation to a tender process, did the local government comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 24E in relation to the preparation of a regional price preference policy (only if a policy had not been previously adopted by Council). | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 24 | F&G Reg 24F | Did the local government comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 24F in relation to an adopted regional price preference policy. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |
| 25 | F&G Reg 11A | Does the local government have a current purchasing policy in relation to contracts for other persons to supply goods or services where the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, \$150,000 or less. | Yes | | Maurice Battilana |



Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries

I certify this Compliance Audit return has been adopted by Council at its meeting on

Signed Mayor / President, Chapman Valley

Signed CEO, Chapman Valley

10.0 Information Items

| AGENDA ITEM: | 10.1 |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| SUBJECT: | RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE - REVIEW |
| PROPONENT: | FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE |
| SITE: | COUNCIL CHAMBERS |
| FILE REFERENCE: | 411.01 |
| PREVIOUS REFERENCE: | NA |
| DATE: | 6th FEBRUARY 2018 |
| AUTHOR: | MAURICE BATTILANA |

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

| Ref | Title | Attached to Report | Under Separate Cover |
|---------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 10.1(a) | Shire of Chapman Valley Risk Management Report | | |

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

BACKGROUND

The State Government introduced legislation under the Local Government (Audit) Audit Regulations, 1996, to stipulate it is a legal requirement for a local government Chief Executive Officer to review the appropriateness and effectiveness of a local government's systems and procedures in relation to:

- a) Risk management,
- b) Internal controls; and
- c) Legislative compliance.

This is known as LG (Audit) Regulation 17.

Council adopted the *Risk Management Policy (CP-017)* at the June 2014 OCM. This Policy is complemented by the *Risk Management Procedure (CMP-028)*.

COMMENT

Procedures are an internal operational document and though a copy has been provided under separate cover **(Attachment 10.1(a))** for Council information there is no legal requirement for Committee or Council to adopt or endorse amendments these documents. This is an internal document the CEO and Senior Staff use to undertake the necessary analysis and review of risk management as required under legislation.

Therefore, the purpose of this item is to simply inform the Committee of the review undertaken by staff of *Risk Management Procedure (CMP-028)*. There are no changes recommended to the existing Procedure. However; the Risk Management Report has been updated to incorporate items completed and to be undertaken by staff. Council do not need to consider the changes to the Report as this is an internal operational document only.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Local Government (Audit) Regulations, 1996

- 17. CEO to review certain systems and procedures
 - (1) The CEO is to review the appropriateness and effectiveness of a local
 - government's systems and procedures in relation to
 - (a) risk management; and
 - (b) internal control; and
 - (c) legislative compliance.
 - The review may relate to any or all of the matters referred to in subregulation (1)(a),
 (b) and (c), but each of those matters is to be the subject of a review at least once every 2 calendar years.
 - (3) The CEO is to report to the audit committee the results of that review.

[Regulation 17 inserted in Gazette 8 Feb 2013 p. 868.]

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Risk Management Policy (CP-017). This Policy is complemented by the *Risk Management Procedure (CMP-028).*

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil affect.

• Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):

No effect on the LFTP

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

| Ref | Objective | Strategy | Action |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | Ensure governance and administration systems, policies and processes are current and relevant | Review policy categories and set ongoing accountability for review processes | Review current Council and Management policies and formalise update process and timelines. |

CONSULTATION

Council staff have been consulted as part of the process to complete the Risk Management Report.

RISK ASSESSMENT

The Risk Management Report has not highlighted any significant areas of risk.

| Measures of Consequence | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Rating (Level) | Health | Financial Impact | Service Interruption | Compliance | Reputational | Property | Environment | | | |
| Insignificant (1) | Negligible injuries | Less than \$1,000 | No material service interruption | No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact | Unsubstantiate d, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item | Inconsequential or no damage. | Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response | | | |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

COMMITTEE / STAFF RECOMMENDATION

MOVED: CR FORTH

SECONDED: CR FARRELL

The Committee receives the Risk Management Report as presented for information only.

CARRIED Voting 2/0 Minute Reference FAC 02/18 - 5

11.0 Urgent Business Approved by the Presiding Member or by Decision of the Committee

Nil

12.0 Closure

The Chairman thanked Elected Members and Staff for their attendance and closed the meeting at 2.37pm.